

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/629,254	WU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dangelino N. Gortayo	2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dangelino N. Gortayo.

(3) Colby Nuttall (58146).

(2) Debbie Le.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 September 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 25,32 and 42.


Identification of prior art discussed: Multer et al. (US Patent 7,007,041 B2).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
9/19/06

  
DEBBIE LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
9/19/06

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative proposed amendments to claim 25 to clarify and more clearly define the local change tracker and the version field maintained for the groups of items stored in the data store layer of the platform, and identifying the replica a version comes from as well as the version change enumerations. Also proposed is a renumbering of the claims, to utilize elements of claim 32 into independent claim 25, and rewriting claim 32. Discussed is the difference between the instant application and the prior art in regards to the version field. More time is needed to study in depth the prior art to see if the limitation is overcome. Also discussed is the 112 rejection and a term has been omitted to overcome the 112 rejection, the word "substantially". Additionally, discussion on renumbering the claims occurred, as claims 26, 28, and 31 are cancelled and rewritten.